Monsieur *JURIEU*'s Judgment

Upon the Question of

Defending our Religion by Arms,

WITH

REFLECTIONS

UPON THE

Affairs of England,

IN HIS

Ninth Pastoral LETTER of the Third Year.

Faithfully Translated out of French.

Licensed, and Entered according to Order.

LONDON:

Printed for *John Lawrence*, at the *Angel* in the *Poultrey*, and are to be sold by *Richard Baldwin*, next the *Black Bull* in the *Old-Bayly*. MDCLXXXIX.

THE Tranſlator TO THE READER.

'TIS *ſaid by the Prophet* Daniel, That many ſhall run to and fro, and knowledge ſhall be encreaſed: *The Commerce of Nations, the Tranſlating from one Language to another, is this running to and fro, whereby Mankind communicate their general Sentiments, improve by the Correſpondence, and are abſolved from the Curſe of* Babel.

People that only meaſure themſelves by themſelves, and compare themſelves among themſelves, *take very ſcanty meaſures, and make very fond compariſons: when they are miſtaken, they have no way of rectifying themſelves, but enjoy a very great ſatisfaction in being poſitive and immovable, tho' they are never ſo much in the wrong.*

In oppoſition to this, the World has always had a great deference to a Catholick Sence; ſo ſoon as ever Chriſtianity enjoyed its liberty under the Glorious Emperour Conſtantine, *there was ſuch an aſſembling of Councils, communicating the Judgment of particular Churches for Agreement of the whole, that the Heathens were wont to*

deride the Christians for tiring the Post-horses, and wearing out the Stage-Coaches of the Empire.

When Christianity was Transubstantiated into Popery, and all the Methods of Religion turn'd against it self, then was Catholicism made use of as the grand Instrument of its own Ruine: The general falling away, *which was the Prediction of a false Religion prevailing, was the chief argument, why that Religion was not false which had prevailed.*

So that we have the Judgment both of Friends and Enemies, those who first setled Religion, and those who afterwards overthrew it, that the general Opinion of the Church of God ought to be of the greatest esteem; especially in those difficult Cases, where we are not our selves able to determine our Duties out of the Holy Scriptures.

'Tis then only disputed, which is the Catholick Church; that which shone bright immediately after our Saviour's time, or that prevailing Faction of Apostates which clouded the Heavens, and cast a mist over the face of the Earth? But the Light of Truth is so sprung forth again, that the Question vanishes; 'tis easy to distinguish between Day and Night.

Now if the Christians had so great an Opinion of their common Agreement, before their Religion was corrupted, why should not we honour the same way? And, since Reformation is but the Restoration of Primitive Religion, be glad to hear what foreign Churches say of those Doctrines which are disputed amongst us.

He is an Enemy to the Church of England, *who would set it up against the Reform'd Churches of* France *and* Germany, *and of the* Northern *Crowns, where God is worshipped also after the manner which his Enemies call Heresy: Why should not the Church of God be esteemed one Catholick Church since its Reformation as well as before its grand Depravation? There were as many Heresies and Schisms*

and

and Errours within its bowels then as now, but the common Agreement of the greater part in ſubſtantial Truths, made the Advice of one Church to another, to be very much reverenced and regarded.

The Judgment of Monſieur Jurieu *is not to be looked upon as his private Opinion, but as the general Sence of the good Chriſtians of* France; *for the Papiſts had an Intrigue to deſtroy the whole Reform'd Religion all over* Europe, *by perſwading the Proteſtants to ſtand ſtill while they were ruined: and to this purpoſe Monſieur* de Meaux *picks up and ridicules the Deciſions of their Synods,* That it was lawful to make uſe of Arms in favour of Religion. *So that this is a Defence of their ancient Doctrine, and reſcuing the Right of Self-preſervation from the hands of their Enemies, in a moſt needful time when they would have taken it away from all men, in order to an Univerſal Deſtruction of the Truth. Certainly the* French *have demonſtrated ſuch eminent Loyalty and Patience, that they well deſerved to be heard upon the Queſtion.*

We may in England *look back with ſome horror upon the danger we have eſcaped; this piece of Polity was framed alſo for the fineſt and ſtrongeſt Intrigue that could bring about our Deſtruction; it was the preſumption of Arbitrary and Irreſiſtible Power, of Abſolute and undeniable Obedience, which heartned our Enemies to ſuch attempts, as they durſt not otherwiſe have thought upon.*

They had the advantage of many Years to make preparation, by preferring ſuch to Places of Honour and Power, who were themſelves generally the greateſt Slaves, and ſo were willing to enſlave others. The choice was made with a great deal of Judgment and Curioſity; either of ſuch whoſe Atheiſm and Debauchery made them ready to do any thing, or of ſuch who had ſuffer'd under the Pretenders to Liberty, and therefore were inclined to an exceſs of Duty.

The former run into all the extravagancies of Bluſphe-

my,

my, having their mouths full of great swelling words, That the King was above Jesus Christ; that Tyranny and Oppression themselves, if acted by Persons in Authority, were the Ordinances of God, and not to be resisted under pain of Damnation. *But Death has eased some places of their burdens, and called those Followers of* Balaam *before a Tribunal, where they shall behold him whom they pierced.*

The better part consider'd the Glories of suffering Religion, how much it was able to bear, and that Passive Obedience had first made its triumphant entry into the World; they therefore encouraged the inferiour Clergy to such a degree, that it was almost received as the Doctrine of the Church of England, *that an Unlimited Authority was of Divine Right; and that tho' Religion was never so much our Property, yet it had a property in it, to yeild up itself and every thing else to the will of the first Invader.*

But so soon as the Rights of our Religious and Civil Liberties were found to be mortally wounded, and that its Interest was to be destroyed by such Sufferings as neither the Laws of God or Man required, then could the Fathers of the Church no longer conceal a Truth, the neglect whereof had near cost them, that which was dearer to them than their Lives; the tenderness they bore to their Children would not expose them to an unnecessary Destruction.

After their personal Sufferings, and the Day-break of our Deliverance appear'd, the late King James *was alarm'd with an expression in the Prince of* Orange's *Declaration,* That he was most earnestly Invited hither by divers of the Lords both Spiritual and Temporal, and by many Gentlemen and others. *He therefore sent for the Archbishop of* Canterbury, *the Bishops of* London, Peterborough, *and* Rochester, *to sign an Abhorrence under their hands of the intended Invasion.*

But this they refused to do; not being able to give up

a Church, which by the Providence of God was by Law eſtabliſhed, and which they had the Care of committed to them: They durſt not diſcountenance a Deliverance which (every body was then ſenſible) was ſo divinely offer'd, and wherein all the Proteſtant Intereſt of Europe *was embarked. This Refuſal the Biſhop of* Rocheſter *has lately publiſhed, and the Archbiſhop of* Canterbury *has favoured with a Licenſe under his own hand.*

So ſoon as the late King James *had thrown up the Government, cancell'd the Writs of Parliament, and withdrawn himſelf from the Kingdom, then did the Archbiſhops of* Canterbury *and* York, *the Biſhops of* Wincheſter, St. Aſaph, Ely, Rocheſter, *and* Peterborough, *with the Lords Temporal that were about* London, *aſſembled at* Guild-hall, *devolv'd themſelves upon the Prince of* Orange, *acknowledging his* great Kindneſs, his great Expence, his Hazard to Reſcue them from Popery and Slavery.

The Convocations of England *had formerly aſſiſted the foreign Proteſtants both with their Prayers and Purſes, now was the happy day of Retribution come, when we were to eat that Bread which was caſt upon the Waters an hundred Years before; It had been a renouncing of the ancient Church of* England, *and the old Charity laid up in ſtore for us, if we had not accepted ſo great a Deliverance.*

The common pertneſs of young Divines, and the invoterate prejudice of ſome elder, will not be able to rencounter the more ancient Judgment, and this late authentick Practice of the Church of England. *It will be ſatisfaction to behold here the concurrence of a foreign Church, for we have always valued Catholicism; but now we much more deſire it, now we are under the Head of the Proteſtant Intereſt, and hope that our preſent Soveraign of* Great Britain *will be another* Britiſh Conſtantine *to the World. Theſe Churches which never had the Favour of Princes, can-*

not

not but want many advantages, and we who were Reform'd by a Prince, who did not only shake off the Pope's Usurpations, but reserved several of them to himself, are capable of being made more happy.

Those that have travell'd abroad, and searcht the Archieves of the Protestant Churches, find how the principal Reformers and Establishers of our Religion consulted them, and how greivously they were afflicted to be over-ruled by secular Men in the Establishment of those things which were not to be found in the Catholicism of the Reform'd Religion.

And we have sadly found the mischief thereof, for men who are the Authors and Abettors of those things, which are particular to themselves, are apt to be more fond of their own Institutions, than of the Catholick and Divine Ordinances; and so the zeal of a particular Church has been in danger of spending it self without being concern'd for, and sometimes in opposition to the Universal.

As I began with one Prophet, so I'll conclude with another; let Isaiah *now revive us with an Assurance, that God will at last give* Kings to be Nursing-fathers, and Queens to be Nursing-mothers to his Church. *And such as we now have,* England *never had before.*

He hath propheſied also, That the light of the Moon shall be as the light of the Sun, and the light of the Sun shall be seven-fold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound.

We have such a litteral accomplishment of this, that 'tis hard not to believe it the design of the place; we have such a seven fold influence of our Sun to revive and comfort the distressed part of the World, and our Moon is equally Soveraign with him. Shall not all this make us happy, the greatest Authority and the best Examples? if not, 'tis because we are the worst People that ever enjoy'd the Sun shine.

The

THE

Ninth *Paſtoral Letter* of the Third Year,

Wherein this Queſtion is Examined,

Whether it be Lawful to Defend our Religion by Arms?

WITH

REFLECTIONS

UPON THE

Affairs of England.

Our moſt Dear Brethren, Grace and Peace be given to you by our God and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.

WE did in our laſt leave Monſieur *Boſſuet* endeavouring with all his might to overthrow Doctor *Burnet*, by making him contradict himſelf; he was alſo labouring to render the Reformation of *England* Odious, and ſeeking for ſome Variations upon the Article of the Lord's Supper.

But theſe Variations being laid aſide, and reſerv'd for Volumes, and perhaps

for future Ages, Mr. *Boſſuet* in the remaining part of his tenth Book enters upon the Wars of Religion.

The conſpiracy of *Amboiſe* comes upon the Stage, dreſt up with I don't know how many Reflections, and as many Demonſtrations to prove, that it ought entirely to be imputed to the *Huguenots*, and had no other cauſe but Religion.

All the Civil Wars of the [illegible] Age are made to re-appear; both the Aſſaſſination of the Duke of *Guiſe* before *Orleans* by *Poltrot*, and that of the Preſident *Minard* by *Stuart* are remembred.

And amongſt all this are inſerted ſome Deciſions of Synods, and other Arguments to prove that the *Calviniſts* think well of maintaining the Goſpel by Arms.

All this fine parcel of Hiſtory is compoſed of many matters of Fact, and one queſtion of Right. The Fact relates to the Civil Wars of the laſt Age, upon which it is not here my buſineſs to diſcourſe, an Anſwer may be given, if it be thought requiſite; and for me, that which hath been already ſaid in my Anſwer to the Jeſuit *Mainburg*'s Hiſtory of *Calviniſm*, may be ſufficient.

The Queſtion of Right is concerned in the taking up, and uſing Arms for the Defence of Religion, which Monſieur *Boſſuet* propoſes as a great Crime in the Proteſtants.

For ſince the Goſpel acknowledges no other Arms but thoſe that are Spiritual, the Church is not to attempt any thing but by the Word, nor to defend itſelf but by Patience.

Thus the Primitive Chriſtians defended themſelves; we cannot find that they repell'd force by force: Their Prayers and their Tears were the only Bucklers they oppoſed to the Violence of their Perſecutors: but behold now a new ſort of Chriſtians, of Reformers of the Church,

Church and the World, who take up Arms, that they may repel the Violences of others by Violences of their own.

These are the fine common places wherewith the Protestants of all *Europe* are at this day entertain'd, to perswade them that they ought patiently, without any Emotion, to suffer the utmost Efforts of Popery to their Ruin.

The circumstances of the present time oblige us to enlarge a little upon this Question; not only in way of Answer to Monsieur *de Meaux* and his Friends, but principally with a design to satisfie some who are truly Conscientious, and not well instructed as to the sense of this Maxim, *That it is not lawful to make use of Arms in favour of Religion.*

First, does it not well become *M.* the Bishop of *Meaux*, and in general the whole Papistry to raise the Reputation of this Maxim, that the Conduct of the Protestants might be rendred Odious? The Papistry, I say, which may be review'd in all Ages as an unchain'd Fury, carrying a Sword in one hand, and Fire in the other, filling *Europe* with Desolations, and bathing the Earth with Bloud, to Establish and Defend itself, *But it is not lawful to employ our Arms in Defence of our Religion.*

But, why then did the Papistry endeavour to replant Christianity in the East, by so many millions of People under the Badge of the Cross? Why were Wars waged expressly under the name of holy Wars? Why did the Popes (to establish the Authority, they pretend to have received from Jesus Christ) bring Desolation upon *Europe*? Why did they dethrone Emperours and Kings? Why have they raised Arms, and bid Battles? Why have they engaged the Father against the Son, and the Son against the Father? Why

have they imployed the Armies of the Croſs, to maſſacre an hundred thouſand *Waldenſes*, and *Albigenſes*? Why does the Tribunal of the Inquiſition find Imployment for Hangmen, Fires, Tortures, Executions in favour of Religion?

Why, when the Papiſtry would firſt ſet its Foot in any place, does it run to Arms with the utmoſt Fury? Why to advance it ſelf does it make uſe of the moſt Abominable Crimes, Aſſaſſinations, Treaſons, Poyſonings of the neareſt Relations, and Benefactors themſelves, burning of Cities, Suppoſitious Shams, and other ſuch like Actions, of which both ancient and modern Hiſtories are able to furniſh us with Examples?

Why does Papiſtry imploy Dragoons, and Souldiers to violate Conſciences, to make People deny a Religion which they believe to be true, and to embrace that which they believe to be falſe; thereby conſtraining them to Prophane and Sacrilegious Communions?

Certainly 'tis a great fineneſs of Wit for Monſieur *de Meaux* to retail this ſevere Maxim in the preſent juncture, *That it is not lawful to employ our Arms in Defence of our Religion.*

Theſe Gentlemen might have been happy in honouring themſelves with ſo fine a peice of Morality, if their Conduct had left no ſuch Footſteps behind: But now the Papiſtical Exceſſes are ſo far from allowing themſelves a juſtification, that they even take away any right of inſulting over their Enemies.

But without all this Monſieur *de Meaux* is to know, that we are not aſham'd to have ſeveral deciſions found in our Synods from whence a concluſion may be drawn, that according to us, it is not always forbidden to make uſe of Arms in favour of Religion.

An

An Abbot is applauded for this, that he bore Arms to maintain the Goſpel. Mr. *Boſſuet* has found it in the National Synod of *Lyons* 1563, and he has made it to be printed in Capital Letters, for the greater remark, and that it might be an Eternal Diſgrace upon all the Party.

What extravagancy of Thought was this in a time, and in a Kingdom, where ſo many Souldiers and Officers bear Arms, not to *maintain* the Goſpel, but to plant Popery in the Hearts of the *Calviniſts*.

It is then very neceſſary to diſtinguiſh between *Eſtabliſhing* Religion, and *Defending* of it. And it is certain, that the Chriſtian Morals do not permit the Eſtabliſhment of Religion by Arms. I have no need to prove it, the thing is evident of its ſelf, and there can hardly be found any people that dare impugn this Truth; and from hence I conclude, that Popery is really Anti-chriſtian, the Antipodes of the Chriſtian Religion.

I know not any other Religion in the World, which forces People by Fire and Sword to renounce their own Sentiments, and to make Profeſſion of that which is offer'd.

Mahomet hath enlarged his Empire by Arms, and the enlargement of his Empire hath conduced very much to the enlargement of his Religion: But we do not ſee at laſt, that the *Califs* and *Mahometan* Princes have put the Knife to the Throats of Chriſtians, to make them abjure Chriſtianity, and to embrace Mahometaniſm, it is true, the Chriſtian Religion has periſhed under their Domination; but by Poverty, and Meanneſs, and Miſery, and Ignorance, to which they had reduced the Chriſtians.

The Glory of *Planting* Chriſtianity by Arms has been due to Popery, and its Princes.

But to *Defend* Religion by

by Arms is another thing, and there is neither Reason nor Authority by which it can be proved to be a Crime. All the World is agreed that Defence is lawful, and allowed by the Laws of Nature, to which the positive Laws of God never made any Contradiction.

It is then lawful to defend ones Life, ones Honour, one's Wife, ones Children, ones Country, and ones Goods by Arms; and is it not lawful to defend ones Religion by the same means?

I would fain be shewed a little from whence the difference arises, and who it is who hath so disarm'd the Religion, as to leave it exposed to the Violence of the first comer?

This Maxim is proved false by the common reason of all Mankind, since a Maxim contrary to it has passed into a Proverb, *Usque ad aras, even to the Altars*, we say, which is as much as to confess that Complaisance and Patience should take place in all things but Altars and Religion.

If this Maxim be true, it must be so Universally, or else the Exceptions ought to be made known to us: If this Maxim, *That it is unlawful to defend Religion by Arms*, be true without Exception; it follows, that an Army of *Turks* invading our Frontiers, and over-flowing our Provinces, only for the Establishment of their Religion, and for the Ruin of ours, it will be unlawful for us to defend our selves. If they do but say, that they desire neither our Goods, nor our Liberties, nor our Country; but only demand of us, to receive their Religion, and quit our own, because there shall be no other Interest in this Demand, but only that of Religion, therefore we must presently lay down our Arms, admit Mahometanism, or at least be content to suffer Martyrdom.

Is

Is it not lawful to repel such Violence by Arms? Who dares advance such an Extravagance!

Our Children, our Goods, and even our Country ought to be sacrific'd for Religion, when it is necessary for the preservation of it; and I shall not dare to defend my Religion by the same means by which I should defend my temporal Interests. This may be sufficient to make it apparent, that the Maxim is false, if taken without any exception.

Now, if there must be exceptions, let them be set forth; here we shall not fail of being told, that it is unlawful to Defend our Religion by Arms, when it is attackt by the lawful Soveraigns of the State. But is this agreeable to the Consciences of the Papists, who make it so criminal in us, that we will not abandon our Religion to the Injustice and Violences of Soveraigns; dare they affirm, that they are disposed to suffer the utmost upon this account?

If their Kings in the most Arbitrary Governments should endeavour to plant, I don't say *Mahometanism* or *Paganism*, by destroying *Christianity*, but *Lutheranism* or *Calvinism* by Violence, would they suffer it, and believe themselves oblig'd to employ no other Arms but Tears, and Patience, and Martyrdom?

I can't tell whether they would dare to say so; they dare say any thing according to the diversity of Times and Interests; but we know very well, that if they should dare to say so, it would be a lye; for it 'tis certain, there is no sort of Violence which they have not made use of to arrest the designs of such a Prince, and deprive him of his Life. We cannot take one step in the History of Papism, without finding proofs, but 'tis needless to report them.

Kings are not Masters

of Conſcience and Religion; they are not ſo much as Maſters of the Lives of their Subjects, how then ſhould they be Maſters of their eternal Salvation, and their Religion?

All thoſe who are not devoted to Flattery, do avow, that the right of *Self-Preſervation* is a right which cannot be alienated: a People hath always right to take care of themſelves by all manner of ways, againſt a Tyrant who would ruin and deſtroy them.

Suppoſe a Soveraign for ſome worldly Intereſt, for the refuſal of Tribute or Homage, or in an Humor, ſhould reſolve upon Maſſacring a whole Nation, or one great party, is there any one ſo much a Flatterer, as to aſſert, that ſuch a Soveraign has right to do it, and that the Subjects have no right to defend themſelves, to oppoſe ſuch Violence with Force?

Such an one will be confuted by all Mankind, for 'tis believed by every one, that he has a right to uſe all means for his own preſervation, when he is ſet upon by an unjuſt Violence.

Having made this Suppoſition, let us make another; Suppoſe a Soveraign ſhould attempt to Maſſacre his Subjects upon the account of Religion; ſhall this cauſe of Religion, which intervenes, tye the hands of the Subjects, annihilate the Laws of Nature, deprive them of the inalienable Right of Self-Preſervation? Shall it be lawful for a People to preſerve and defend themſelves when they are to be maſſacred for refuſing unjuſt Taxes, and ſhall it not be lawful to defend themſelves when they are to be maſſacred upon the account of Religion?

I muſt ſay this is a ſottiſh piece of Morality: let him that deſires to lye at the Foot-ſtool of a Throne, and flatter Kings, maintain it; no man will ever really believe it.

'Tis

'Tis of no great advantage to argue upon the Rights of Soveraigns; 'tis a queſtion we will not enter upon. But thus much we ought to know, That the Rights of GOD, the Rights of the People, and the Rights of Kings are inſeparable: This good ſence demonſtrates, and therefore a Prince that annihilates the Right of GOD and the Right of the People, does thereby annihilate his own Right.

Nothing is due to him who pays nothing to any one, neither to God nor men.

The Suppoſition we make, is not a Caſtle in the Air; and, without ſpeaking of Princes called Chriſtian (who have maſſacred their Subjects upon the account of Religion) the Hiſtory of the Church preſents us with *Diocleſian*, who enterprized the extirpation of Chriſtians by an univerſal Maſſacre: Where is it to be found in the Goſpel, that the Chriſtian-Subjects of the *Roman* Empire had no right to oppoſe this Violence; whereas, if for any other cauſe than that of Religion, their Emperours had oppreſſed them in ſuch a manner, they might have had right to defend themſelves? If this be ſo, Religion is of the meaneſt concern in the World.

If the whole World had courage enough to ſuffer Martyrdom, the Spiritual Intereſt of Religion would not be ſo deeply concerned; but when 'tis to be conſider'd, that in a Million of Chriſtians, perhaps not ten Thouſand of them are ſo diſpoſed as to endure maſſacring, we are to recollect, that ſuch an expoſing the Truth, expoſes the Faithful to the dangers of Apoſtaſie, gives up an innumerable company of the Weaker to ruin, and ſuffers the whole Church to be deſtroyed.

If this be ſo, that 'tis always unlawful to main-

tain the True Religion by Arms, wherefore is the Memory of the *Maccabees* ſo bleſſed in the Church? Why are they not accurſed by the Wiſe? Why are they applauded for having taken Arms againſt the Kings of *Syria*, their lawful Soveraigns? The Perſecution of the famous *Antiochus* was meerly upon the account of Religion: for the *Jews* were very ſubmiſſive both in their Tribute and all other Homage: But he would oblige them to abjure their Religion, for which many ſuffer'd Martyrdom with admirable Patience. The *Maccabees* had alſo the ſame way to ſignalize their courage; but they took another way, they took up Arms, they defended their Religion, they ſhook off the Yoke of the Kings of *Syria*, not only as to their Spiritual but their Temporal Bondage.

An exact preſident for the States of the *United Provinces* in the laſt Age, who having taken up Arms firſt to maintain their Religion, then ſhook off the temporal Yoke of *Spain*, and made themſelves a ſeparate State.

Monſieur *de Meaux* and his Friends, who ſo boldly cenſure the *Hollanders* for taking Arms upon the account of their Religion, and for having taken that occaſion to ſhake off an inſupportable Yoke, ought to make out the difference between the caſe of the *Maccabees*, and that of the *Low Countries*.

It is incumbent upon him, who ſo furiouſly rallies our Synods for recommending an Abbot *who bore Arms in defence of the Goſpel*, to draw an Indictment againſt the Memory of thoſe grand Hero's of the *Jewiſh* Church, whom all Chriſtians admire, and whoſe Conduct they approve.

But there is now an Objection fram'd from the Conduct of the Primitive Chriſtians, who during the ten Perſecutions never rencountred

countred their Perſecutors with any thing but Patience. God forbid, that I ſhould diminiſh their Worth, or abate any thing of thoſe Acknowledgements which are due to them: but I want to be inſtructed, how they were in a condition to provide againſt the Violences of the *Roman* Emperours.

I don't know that the Chriſtians were as one to five hundred, if you take the whole extent of the *Roman* Empire: There are Authors that believe *Rome* it ſelf could not number above forty thouſand Chriſtians in the ſecond and third Ages; whereas in the laſt accounts, the Chriſtians were reckon'd to riſe to many Millions. If then there were ſo few in the capital City, how could there be ſo great an appearance in other places? How then could ſo ſmall a number of People, ſcatter'd thorough the extent of ſo vaſt an Empire, maintain themſelves, where there were numerous Armies on foot to guard their ſpacious Frontiers? 'Twas not then onely Religion but Prudence in the firſt Chriſtians to ſuffer a leſs evil to avoid a greater: if they had opened themſelves into a ſtate of Defence, they had been exſpos'd to inevitable Death, ſo that they had no other way but to conceal themſelves.

Tertullian is cited upon this occaſion, who reports that the Chriſtians fill'd the Cities, the Caſtles, the Armies; but 'tis known that *Tertullian* was an Orator, and amplified things more than ever any Writer in the Church did. It would be a very hard thing to make good all he hath ventur'd upon.

But, there is ſomething elſe very conſiderable as to the conduct of the Primitive Chriſtians in the point of taking Arms: there were many then who believed it altogether unlawful to uſe the Sword upon any occaſion, either in War or Judgment for

the punishment of Criminals. This was an extravagant Opinion, a Maxim generally acknowledged to be false at this day; so that Patience was sometimes an Errour, and a piece of Morality not well understood.

At the bottom, it was not this fineness of Conscience, which hindred the first Christians to defend themselves against their Persecutors: for the Devotional Persons, whose Morality was so severe, were a small number in comparison to others. And by the complaints which the Fathers make of the Christians Manners in their Age; it is easie to collect, that so many Christians, being then irregular in the other conduct of their lives, did not suffer themselves to be massacred for Conscience sake, but because they were impotent and indefensible.

Yet suppose the Primitive Christians did meerly out of tenderness of Conscience neglect to defend themselves, it shall be confessed, they did not do ill: and yet it does not follow, that those who do not imitate them do ill. For 'tis always lawful to remit ones right; a man may do with his own what he will: yet another man does not sin, because he will maintain his right.

'Tis a very high degree of Regeneration, to quit ones Goods to an unjust Invader, for avoiding of Resistance: but still those who have not advanced so far in their Regeneration, are not in a state of Sin.

There is a difference between *better* and *well*: *He that giveth his Virgin in marriage doth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doth better.* According to St. *Paul*. Suppose then these Christians did *better* in not taking up Arms to defend themselves from Persecution, it does not follow, but others may do *well*, though they do otherwise; and perhaps

perhaps *better* in their different circumſtances.

Another Objection is found out in the words of our Saviour: *Whoſoever ſhall ſmite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other alſo. And if any man will ſue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak alſo.*

Firſt, It muſt be obſerved, that our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt deſigned this for particular perſons, not for Societies and Corporations: 'tis an extravagance to maintain, that Societies, and States, and Kingdoms are obliged to ſubmit themſelves to every unjuſt Oppreſſor, that does invade them. Private perſons for the publick peace do well to obſerve this direction of Jeſus Chriſt, but for the publick good, Governors of States are obliged to act otherwiſe. Now the Church is a Corporation, a Society, and by conſequence ought to preſerve her Aſſemblies, and her Subjects, and to do it in all thoſe ways which are lawful by the right of Nations, and of Nature.

Secondly, Our Saviour there ſpeaks of worldly Intereſts, not of ſacred things and Religion: Jeſus Chriſt never bid us quit our Religion, our Temples, our Altars, to him that would raviſh them from us; but to part with our Coat and our Cloak. There is no manner of conſequence from the one to the other.

Certainly our Lord never had any deſign to convert the proceedings of Juſtice into Crimes; when a man endeavour'd to run under covert from the violent perſuits of an Invader that would take away his Goods from him: Chriſtian Morality never puſh'd on Severity at ſuch a rate. If then, notwithſtanding this Precept of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, it is permitted by the Laws of the Goſpel to reſiſt an unjuſt Oppreſſour that would take away our Goods from us; by much

ſtronger

ſtronger reaſon is this Commandment far from prejudicing our right of defending Religion by Arms.

Laſtly, This Commandment is ſo far from favouring ſuch extravagant Morality, that it gives no countenance to it; for in this paſſage our Saviour ſets forth how far our Patience is oblig'd: 'Tis that we ſuffer moderate Injuries, a box o'th' ear, tolerable loſſes, as to be robbed of a Cloak, or ſuch temporal Goods, whoſe preſervation was not equivalent to the loſs of our Peace: but he does not ſay, if any one would take away thy Life, don't defend it. So that take our Saviour's words in the utmoſt rigour, he hath not left it unlawful for a man to defend his Life.

Now if it be lawful for a man to defend his Life againſt Tyrants, that would take it away for temporal reaſons; I can not ſee why it may not be lawful to defend it when they would murder us upon the account of Religion. We ought then to ſuffer even to the laſt extremity, but this extremity is come when they would raviſh from us that which is more dear than Life it ſelf, our Religion and our Eternal Salvation.

Another Argument, for maintaining this piece of ſevere Morality, that we ought not to take up Arms for the defence of our Religion, is drawn from the words of Jeſus Chriſt to his Diſciples upon the *Samaritans* denying him reception: The Diſciples ſaid to our Lord, *Wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and conſume them even as Elias did.* The Lord anſwered them, *Ye know not what manner of ſpirit ye are of; for the Son of man is not come to deſtroy mens lives.*

Now what does this ſignifie? You ſhall have it in a word, that it is never lawful to open a way for

for Jeſus Chriſt to enter by force, nor to eſtabliſh the Goſpel by Arms: but if the *Samaritans* had come to a Houſe that belong'd to Jeſus Chriſt, or any of his Diſciples, would have driven them out of it and diſpoſſeſſed them, think you that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt would have order'd his Diſciples to be gone and ſeek a lodging ſome where elſe? I ſee nothing like it.

For once again, there is a vaſt difference between *Attacking* and *Defending*: The Goſpel has not taken away from any man the right of defending himſelf againſt violent Aggreſſors.

And this without doubt our Saviour intended, when he was walking in the Garden, where he knew the *Jews* would come and ſeize him by violence; he then order'd his Diſciples that he who had a Sword ſhould take it: and when one ſaid, *Behold, here are two Swords*, he anſwered, *it is enough.*

This was not enough to repel the violence he was to meet withal, for two armed men were not able to oppoſe the armed Multitude, that accompanied *Judas*; but it was enough for his purpoſe, to let his Diſciples know, that upon ſuch an occaſion they had a right to defend themſelves with Arms.

For otherwiſe what ſence can there be in this, Take your Swords: of what uſe could they be if they might not defend themſelves? It is true, that Jeſus Chriſt commanded St. *Peter* to put up his Sword into his Sheath; and he healed the Ear of *Malchus*: But by this he gives us to underſtand, that tho' he has right to repel force with force, yet he would have his Diſciples make uſe of it only as a proper time and occaſion may require. And he there gives the reaſon of it: 'tis becauſe *that* ought to be accompliſh'd which was ordained by the Father. And that which he adds

to

to St. *Peter*, when he bid him put up his Sword into the Sheath, *viz All they that take the Sword ſhall periſh by the Sword*, cannot ſignifie that uſing the Sword is always unlawful, or chiefly when it is employed upon the account of Religion, it cannot I ſay, ſignifie any thing like it: For,

Firſt, 'tis falſe; ſince there are an hundred occaſions, where the uſe of the Sword is notoriouſly known to be lawful.

Secondly, Jeſus Chriſt would have contradicted himſelf upon the very ſpot; for there he ſays, *Let him that hath a Sword, take it: Behold two, it is enough.*

So that this muſt ſignifie that he who ſtrikes unjuſtly with the Sword, ſhall periſh by the Sword. Now one may ſtrike unjuſtly with the Sword upon theſe two accounts, either when he does it that he has no right, or when this right is made uſe of upon ſome occaſion that is not agreeable to the Pleaſure of God. St. *Peter* had not uſed his Sword in a proper ſeaſon; not but that he had a right, which it was not then a time to exerciſe, for then God would have Jeſus Chriſt die, and St. *Peter* ought to have underſtood it.

In a word, Jeſus Chriſt commanded to take the Sword, for eſtabliſhing the Right which the Church has to defend herſelf againſt unjuſt Oppreſſors; and he forbid *Peter* to ſtrike, to teach the Church, that ſhe ought to ſubmit when God has made known his Will, that ſhe muſt ſuffer.

If Mr. *Boſſuet* the preſent defender of this ſevere Moral, That *we are forbidden to maintain the Goſpel by Arms*, finds our Morality to looſe in this point, he will do well to call into his help for our Correction, *Eſcobar*, *Tambourin*, *Caramuel*, and all the Tribe of new Caſuiſts, who are very good Catholicks, and as good Catholicks as they are, make it law-

lawful to kill a Man for a Crown-piece, or an Apple.

Nevertheleſs we have no deſign at all to inſpire with the ſentiments of Revenge, thoſe who have ſuffer'd ſo cruel a Perſecution in *France* upon the account of Religion. God forbid, we do on the contrary render thanks to God, that not one of them has been prevail'd upon to do any Action of Violence; for though they could not have deſtroyed others, without having been deſtroyed themſelves, yet it is a ſurprizing conſideration, that among ſo many people of different Characters, there ſhould not be found a great number, who would act the part of *Sampſon*, to bury themſelves, and their Enemies under the ſame Ruins, which was eaſie for them to have done. But the Patience wherewith they have ſuffer'd is an Argument that the Spirit of God hath ſuſtained them in their Calamities.

Nor do we pretend here to make a defence for all the Wars which have been undertaken upon the account of Religion, nor all thoſe which were for the Defence of a good Religion.

As the taking up Arms has always dreadful conſequences, it is certain that of two Evils the greateſt is to be avoided, and that it is better to ſuffer moderate Oppreſſions, than to run to extreme Remedies.

But my Deſign is to let Mr. *Boſſuet* ſee, that he does not know what he ſays, when he would make it ſo criminal in our People, *to approve thoſe who bear Arms to maintain the Goſpel.* As if in this they had done any fooliſh and odious Action. There are ſome Extremities beyond which Chriſtian Morality does not oblige us to carry our Patience. And I think no one can imagine a greater Extremity, than when it comes to maſſacring.

When the firſt War of Religion began in the laſt Age, the Maſſacre of *Vaſ-*

ſy had given the ſignal to all *France*. There was no longer any place wherein the Proteſtants could be with ſafety. And by conſequence it was time to make uſe of the Right of Self-preſervation, which no Preſcription, no Uſurpation of the Mighty can ever annihilate.

But when only the Preſervation or Death of ſome particular Perſons is the concern, as it was in the Reigns of *Francis* the 1ſt, and *Henry* the 2d, then was it a time for Patience, but when the Life of a whole People is in hazard, and in extream hazard, then there muſt be a recourſe to extream Remedies.

There may be alſo certain Circumſtances, when People are not oblig'd to attend the moſt extream Evils before they run to Redreſs them. When the whole Nation ſees the Prince in a Reſolution to extirpate the eſtabliſhed Religion, a ſtop ought to be put at the beginning.

'Tis therefore that the *Engliſh* Nation cannot be blamed, in their preſent Conduct againſt their King, except it be by thoſe People who are full of their Prejudices, or Slaves to the great ones under whom they live, or elſe altogether ignorant of the Laws of *England*.

When the King had once made himſelf Maſter of the Laws and Religion, it would then have been too late to have ſought for a Remedy.

REFLECTIONS

REFLECTIONS
UPON THE
Affairs of England.

WE know very well, my Brethren, that in the Kingdom where you are, 'tis made a point of Honour, and of Conſcience, to ſpeak all that can be imagin'd cruel and outragious againſt the *Engliſh* Nation, againſt the Church of *England*, and againſt all thoſe illuſtrious Perſons who are at the head of that Action which is now brought to paſs in *England*. This great and ſudden Revolution, which is at this day the aſtoniſhment of all *Europe*, is the execration of Bigots, who diſcharge their fury upon thoſe names which will one day make them tremble.

Behold (ſay they) the Spirit of your Religion, 'tis Rebellion, a Revolt from Soveraigns, 'tis a black Invaſion of the powers ordain'd by God.

I know well that you ought upon this occaſion to have a ſtrict guard over the meaſures you take, and to conduct yourſelves with a great deal of diſcretion: and I fear there are ſome amongſt you ill enough inform'd to give an ill account of an Affair, not only moſt innocent, but even the moſt glorious and the greateſt that has been atchieved for many Ages.

To convince you of this Truth, you ought to know principally that the Qualification of the King of *England* is as inconſiſtent with that of a *Roman* Catholick, as the Qualification of a *Lutheran* or *Calviniſt* is

with that of a Pope. Nothing is more oppoſite to the Fundamental Laws of the State.

I. It is forbidden under the pain of High Treaſon to perform any Exercise of the *Romiſh* Religion within the Kingdom. How can this be conſiſtent with a Popiſh King, who requires Maſs to be ſaid publickly in the moſt eminent places of the State, in his Royal-houſes, in the Countries, in the Cities of the Realm.

II. 'Tis the Crime of High Treaſon in the firſt degree, againſt the State and the Laws, to give reception to Prieſts and Monks within the Kingdom. How can this agree with the condition of a Popiſh King, who provides for Covents of Monks in his own Palace, and every City.

III. 'Tis a Crime forbidden by the Laws, and puniſhable with Death, to acknowledge the Pope to be Head of the Church, and Vicar of Jeſus Chriſt. How can this be conſiſtent with a King who makes publick profeſſion of recognizing the Pope as Head of the Univerſal Church?

IV. 'Tis the Law of *England*, that what man ſoever holds correſpondence with the Pope in any manner, he ſhall be deemed guilty of High Treaſon. How can this be conſiſtent with the quality of a Papiſt in a King, who believes himſelf obliged to receive the Pope's *Nuncio's* in his Court, and to ſend his Ambaſſadors to him?

V. By the Laws of *England*, the King is obliged to make the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance to be tender'd to all his Subjects; by which the King is acknowledged the only Supreme Governour of the Church of *England*, and wherein the Superiority of the Pope as well in Spirituals as Temporals is expreſly renounced. I would fain know how this can be adjuſted with the

the nature of a Popiſh King? What kind of Monſter is it, whoſe Body is a Proteſtant Church, and whoſe Head is an utter Popiſh King?

VI. 'Tis a capital Crime by Law to ſolicit People and Subjects to be reconciled to the See of *Rome*. How can this be conſiſtent with the Conſtitution of a Popiſh King who believes himſelf oblig'd in Conſcience to bring back all his Subjects to the *Romiſh* Church, by Threats and Promiſes, by Puniſhments and Rewards, and Seducements?

VII. 'Tis a capital Crime in *England* for any perſon to promiſe Obedience to the Biſhop of *Rome*. How can this agree with the nature of a Popiſh King who calls the Pope Holy Father, and ſubmits himſelf to him, at leaſt in Spirituals?

VIII. 'Tis one of the Laws of the Kingdom, that whoever enjoys any publick Office, ſhall be obliged to take the Oath of the Teſt; by which the *Romiſh* Religion is abjur'd and deteſted. But how can this be conſiſtent with the conſtitution of a Popiſh King, who poſſeſſes the principal Place of the Kingdom, and therefore ſo publickly embraces and defends the *Romiſh* Religion? There is no end of reciting all the Laws of *England*, from whence there is an abſolute inconſiſtency between the being of a King, and the being of a Papiſt in the ſame Perſon.

Thus then 'tis evident, that without Injuſtice, the *Engliſh* Nation, and the Church of *England* might declare to the King, that his Religion rendred him uncapable of the Crown.

It is true, the Crown of *England* is Succeſſive; but according to all Laws, and in all places of the World, he that receives a Succeſſion, receives it with all the Charges, which by Law are annexed to it, or he falls from it: He that receives an Eſtate charg'd

with Rents and Obligations, muſt perform them, muſt yeild Faith and Homage, if he would enter into poſſeſſion of the Inheritance.

It is yet more certain, that in Succeſſive Crowns there are certain Qualifications which ought to be in the Succeſſour; if he has them not, he muſt have a Guardian, or a Regent muſt be made, or the Crown devolves to the next fit Heir, who has the Qualifications required by Law.

The Crown of *England* has a Happineſs above any other Crown in *Europe*, to be ſubject to certain Laws which are above the King; ſo that a perſon who hath not the qualities requiſite, or ſuch as are inconſiſtent with the Laws, is not capable of being admitted to the Crown, tho' he ſhould have the Right of Inheritance.

All the World knows, that the *French* Popiſh Lords who were in the Intereſts of *Henry* IV, after the Aſſaſſination of *Henry* III, prayed him to receive the Crown, but in the quality of a *Roman* Catholick King, as inſeparably requiſite to the quality of a King of *France*: They had not the ſame right to diſcourſe at ſuch a rate; for the Kings of *France* had for a long time rais'd themſelves above the Laws; and *Henry* being in ſuch a State, might have taken it with his Priviledges.

Beſides it was falſe, that there were any Laws in *France*, which made the quality of a King, and the quality of a Proteſtant to be inconſiſtent; whereas in *England* 'tis apparent, that the condition of a King, and the condition of a Papiſt are irreconcilable.

Nevertheleſs, ſuch was the goodneſs of the Church of *England*, and the *Engliſh* Nation, that they would not exclude *James* II. from the Crown; perſwading themſelves that they had laid an inviolable Obligation upon him, religiouſly to

to keep the Oaths made at his Coronation, in preſerving Religion and the Laws as he found them.

But this Prince ſuffer'd himſelf to be lead by the moſt impudent of Mankind, who lifted him up above the Laws, and made him forget the Devoir of the Kings of *England*, which is to Rule according to the Laws. He made a League with a great neighbouring Prince, to ruin the Proteſtant Religion in all *Europe*: He diſpens'd with all the Laws both of Government and Religion: He made Maſs be ſaid publickly in the three Kingdoms; He inveſted the Papiſts with the principal Offices of State, turning out the Proteſtants: He would conſtrain the Biſhops by corporal Puniſhments, to thoſe things which were againſt their Conſciences.

And that which is the unconceivable Prodigy of Ages, in a Proteſtant Kingdom, he raiſed up a Jeſuite to be a Member of the Council of State, of the Privy-Council, of the Council, in a word, that Governs the whole Kingdom. So a Jeſuite was ſeen Maſter of the Kingdom, Maſter of the Biſhops, Maſter of the Church of *England*.

It was neceſſary therefore to think of ſecuring Religion and the State; and this the Nation was indiſpenſably oblig'd to. To this purpoſe did ſhe implore the Succour of that Prince, who, now in *England*, is the greateſt Perſon of *Europe*: and therefore 'tis againſt him chiefly, that the Country, where you are, diſcharges its Rage; as if he had violated all the Rights of Nature, and trampled under Foot the Obligations of Conſanguinity.

Firſt, it appears, that he was called upon by the Nation; this, I ſay, appears by the ſuddenneſs of the Revolution, which was brought to paſs ſo ſoon as it began: The only Princeſs of the Blood, that was in *England*, and the Prince her Husband, declared themſelves for him; all the great Men, the Peers, the Cities, the Provinces acknowledged the Juſtice of his

his Demands, and supported them.

If this Prince had refus'd to have afforded Succour to the Nation, she would have done the very same without him, that she now does under his Banners; and from thence would have unavoidably followed the ruin of the Monarchy.

For the State was divided into divers Parties, as it was under *Charles* I: It is apparent that the Anarchical and Independant Party have once gained the power over it; so that we might have seen the Nation return to the same Estate it was under *Cromwell*, and perhaps to a worse. The King might very possibly have been exposed to the same Miseries which his Father suffer'd.

The Prince therefore, for the Interest of the State, for the Interest of the Princesses, for his own, and also for the King's, could not dispense with putting himself at the head of an Expedition, which might have been ruin'd, if it had not been governed by so great a Soul.

And then for the pretended Obligations of Consanguinity, they are meer appearances: there are Obligations much more indispensable: *He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me.* We owe to God, to the Laws, to Religion, more than to our Kindred. It had been a cruel piece of Piety to have seen a Church and a Kingdom perish without relieving them, for fear of offending one Person with whom we have some relation of Flesh and Bloud.

I know our Enemies will not scruple saying, that it was not Piety, but Ambition, that gave life to these great Motions; which this Great Prince was very sensible of. But we who are near him, and have known his sentiments for many Years, are able to witness two things; one is, that he is truly touch'd with the Love of God and his Religion. The other is, that he did not undertake this Enterprize till the last Extremity.

And

And we know with the greateſt certainty, that the *Engliſh* were twenty times refuſed upon the Propoſition which they made; becauſe he always hoped that God would open ſome ſofter Methods to protect Religion from the Oppreſſion which was prepared for it. Thoſe that are near him, can witneſs, that there never was a Prince more Zealous, and better affected to the Truth.

The Succeſs, which God hath given to his Enterprizes, may convince us, that he it is, whom God is pleaſed to make uſe of, for accompliſhing his great Deſigns, and for the eſtabliſhment of the True Religion.

One might further ſay things much more conſiderable for Juſtification of this Great Enterprize, with reſpect both to the Nation and the Prince: but time will place them in a better Light, and it ſhall be made known, that thoſe who have ſhed ſo much Bloud, and have had no reſpect to the Laws of Conſanguinity, merit not regard upon their account.

Nevertheleſs, the Prince has, and always will have a regard to the King, whoſe Deſtiny is ſo much lamented: for he has no deſign againſt his Perſon, or againſt his Dignity; he would onely take away from him the means of hurting others, and of hurting himſelf: But this Unfortunate Prince, by following the Inſpirations of that unhappy Genius which hath animated him for ſo many Years, has caſt himſelf into a Precipiece, and ſaught his Safety by forſaking his Palace and his Kingdom, without having any juſt cauſe for it.

It cannot be ſaid with any truth, that the King of *England* could obſerve, either in the Conduct of the Prince, or the Lords, or the Biſhops, or the People, any deſign to attack his Perſon, his Life, his Liberty, or his Dignity. On the contrary, every thing was ſo diſpoſed, that Affairs might be treated of with the greateſt ſweetneſs.

In the firſt Addreſs, which was preſented to the King,

after the Prince's arrival, by fourteen or fifteen of the Lords Eccleſiaſtical and Temporal, they promiſe, after they have entreated for a free Parliament, to ſerve him with all their power, and the power of their Friends.

And in the laſt great Council held *Decemb.* 9th, conſtituted of all that were conſiderable at *London*, it is certain that the King was only askt to call a free Parliament; but this was done with ſuch reſpectful and tender Expreſſions, that 'tis evident the Nation had no deſign againſt the Perſon, or Dignity of the King.

And the King having agreed upon the meeting of a Parliament upon the 25th of *January*, the Prince accepted of it upon the moſt reaſonable condition that can be imagined: Which was, that neither his own, nor the King's Army ſhould come within forty Miles of the place where the Parliament ſate.

Here it appear'd, that the King had no ſincere intention in calling the Parliament, and that it was only to gain time, and to receive the foreign Aſſiſtance which he expected. Theſe Succours failing, and his own Troopes declaring, that they could not fight againſt the Laws and Religion of their Country; he was reſolv'd ſuddenly to play the part of quitting his Throne: Chooſing, rather not to Reign, than not to Reign over the Laws; and to take the advantage of an odious imputation againſt the Proteſtants, that they had driven him from his Kingdom.

But all *Europe* is witneſs to the contrary: and if hereafter he looſes the Crown, 'tis a loſs for which he can only blame himſelf, having drawn it upon himſelf, partly by Violation of the Laws, and partly by his Deſertion.

If there had been any deſign violently to drive him from his Throne, why was he ſo ſtopt in his Flight? What an Object is a King Arreſted as a Fugitive! But why was he ſtaid to do him Violence?

Was he not honourably entreated to return to his own Palace? Had he not the liberty given, to retire as he was beſt pleaſed?

I queſtion not, but all this ſhall be reflected upon us with the moſt malevolent Influences; for 'tis a common thing with the Papiſm in its rage, to take hold of all that may any way ſerve its Revenge.

But be wiſe, and Adore the profound Judgments of God. You ſee in this Event, the firſt blow to the ruin of Popery, which we have propoſed apparently near, out of the Prophecies of the *New Teſtament:* This great and ſurprizing Revolution will without doubt draw others after it, which ſhall be no leſs conſiderable. The Empire of Antichriſt hath not received ſo terrible a check ſince the laſt Age: it rouls down to its Fall, and God viſibly puſhes it upon the Precipiece.

Keep ſilence then, my Brethren, but do not ſuffer your ſelves to be carried down the ſtream of Outrages againſt him whom God hath choſen for the Inſtrument of his great Work.

Remember the Injuſtice which the Papiſts have been guilty of at this time: To violate Laws, which ought to have been moſt inviolable, to break their Oaths, to trample under Foot the moſt ſacred Engagements, to ſeize upon the Miſerable, and force them to Abjuration, to throw them into Priſons, to ſend them to Gallies, to Baniſh them, and confiſcate their Goods: This is all good and lawful for advancing the Catholick Religion.

But to maintain the Reform'd Religion by maintaining Laws, and to repreſs the Enterprizes of thoſe that would violate them, this is an horrible Attempt, an infernal Action.

Is not this to weigh Actions in unequal Balances?

January 1, 1689. *With the Priviledge of our Lords the States.*

Rotterdam, at the Houſe of *Abr. Acker*, near the *Bourſe*.

Books lately Printed for J. Lawrence, *at the* Angel *in the* Poultrey.

I.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Nature, Power, and Proper Effects of the Preſent Conventions in both Kingdoms, called by the Prince of *Orange*. *Quarto.*

II.

A Political Conference between *Aulicus* a Courtier, *Demas* a Country-man, and *Civicus* a Citizen, Clearing the Original of Civil Government, the Powers and Duties of Soveraigns and Subjects, in a familiar and plain Way, which may be underſtood by every ordinary Capacity. *Quarto.*

III.

Liberty of Conſcience Explicated and Vindicated, and the Juſt Limits betwixt it and Authority Sacred and Civil Cleared. *Quarto.*

IV.

The Triumphs of Grace: or, the laſt Words and Edifying Death of the Lady *Margaret de la Muſſe*, a Noble *French* Lady, Aged only Sixteen Years. *Twelves.*

317728